



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INFLUENCE OF FRENCH FARCE UPON THE PLAYS OF JOHN HEYWOOD.

A CRITICISM OF WILHELM SWOBODA.¹

FOR some time writers have observed that John Heywood's plays, especially *Johan Johan the husbande*, *Tyb his wyfe*, and *syr Jhān the preest and Pardoner and Frere*, occupy a unique place in English dramatic literature. Collier writes that

These productions form an epoch in the history of our drama, as they are neither Miracle plays nor Morals, but entirely different from both; several of them come properly within the definition of "interludes," pieces played in the intervals of entertainments, and having frequently both clever humor and strong character to recommend them. They were, as far as we can now judge, *an entire novelty*, and gained the author an extraordinary reputation.²

Ten Brink gives our author great credit by saying: "Heywood did not actually create English comedy, but certainly many of its essential elements."³

Thomas Warton, to his amusing statement that Heywood's plays "are destitute of plot, humor, or character," adds the following interesting criticism:

He is called our first writer of comedies. But those who say this speak without determinate ideas, and confound comedies with moralities and interludes. We will allow that he is among the earliest of our dramatists who drove the Bible from the stage, and introduced representations of familiar life and popular manners.⁴

This last sentence unconsciously shows admirable insight into the exact nature of Heywood's work in the two plays already mentioned; for, free from biblical or didactic purpose, they do repre-

¹ WILHELM SWOBODA, *John Heywood als Dramatiker: Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des englischen Dramas* ("Wiener Beiträge zur deutschen und englischen Philologie," No. III; Vienna, 1888).

² J. P. COLLIER, *English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage* (London, 1879), Vol. I, p. 114.

³ B. TEN BRINK, *History of English Literature*, translated by L. D. SCHMITZ (London, 1896), Vol. II, Part 2, p. 140.

⁴ T. WARTON, *History of English Poetry*, ed. W. C. HAZLITT (London, 1874), Vol. IV, p. 81.

sent "familiar life and popular manners" in a realistic, fun-loving, and, as we may hope to show, French-farce manner.

By far the most exhaustive and important study of John Heywood is that of Wilhelm Swoboda. In speaking of the dramatic advance of Heywood's plays upon previous English morality and miracle-plays, this writer says:

Der erste englische Dramatiker, der diesen Weg betrat, und so der Moses, wenn auch nicht der Josua des regulären Dramas wurde, ist John Heywood. . . . Auf diesem Fortschritt die ganze folgende Entwicklung des englischen Lustspiels beruht.¹

In spite of this agreement concerning Heywood's importance in the founding of English comedy, his relations to preceding English and continental literature have received no exhaustive study. A study of Heywood's relations to preceding and contemporary English drama is a most important feature of Swoboda's monograph, since his is the only attempt made as yet to provide a genealogy for the most striking examples of early English comedy. In a special chapter on the relations of Heywood's plays to literary predecessors,² Swoboda states his main thesis as follows:

Die komischen Interludes³ John Heywoods sind legitime Nachkommen der Moralitäten und werden mit Recht als das Bindeglied zwischen diesen allegorisch-didaktischen Spielen und dem regulären englischen Lustspiel angesehen. Es muss daher zwischen den beiden ersteren eine starke Familienähnlichkeit herrschen.⁴

Leaving for the present Swoboda's development of this thesis, I venture to propose an entirely different genealogy for at least three of these plays, basing my thesis especially upon a study of *Johan Johan the husbande*, *Tyb his wyfe*, and *syr Jhān the preest, Pardoner and Frere*, and *Dialogue on Wit and Folly*.

¹ SWOBODA, p. 8.

² SWOBODA, pp. 55-67, "Das Verhältniss des komischen Interludes zu literarischen Vorgängern."

³ For the reason that "Der blosser name Interlude . . . lässt keinen Schluss auf den dramatischen Charakter derselben zu," SWOBODA (p. 5) distinguishes "zwischen dem komischen und dem moralischen Interlude." For the same reason I shall sometimes refer to HEYWOOD's *Johan Johan the husbande* and *Pardoner and Frere* as *farces*, hoping to justify my usage by the conclusions of this article.

⁴ SWOBODA, p. 55.

I shall try to show that *John*¹ and *Pardoner* are unqualified examples of French farce, that *Wit and Folly* belongs to the *débat* type of French farce, and that each of the three plays has an exact and more or less contemporary analogue extant in French.

Since I am trying to supplant English morality-play by French farce as the parent of several of Heywood's plays, we must at the outset define the alien genre. Without discussing the etymology of the word "farce,"² we may notice that the modern technical dramatic meaning of the word was attached to it at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and is associated with that body of short comic dramas with which we are especially concerned. For a definition of "farce" as we are to use it we may first consult an early writer on French poetic forms. Thomas Sibilet says:

La Farce retient peu ou rien de la comédie Latine, aussi a vray dire ne seroient de rien les actes et scenes; et en seroit la prolixité ennuyeuse; car le vray subject de la farce ou sottye françoise sont badineries, nigauderies, et toutes sorties esmouvantes a ris et plaisir.³

From this definition we can easily extract a satisfactory conception of farce. In the first place, its sole purpose is to amuse, with no attempt whatever to edify or instruct. This characteristic separates it at once from the morality and from most English interludes, since all moralities and most interludes have allegory and a didactic tendency. We notice also that a farce

¹ Henceforth I shall refer to HEYWOOD's six plays by the following abbreviations: *John* = *Johan Johan the husbände, Tyb his Wyfe, and syr Jhân the preest*; *Pardoner* = *Pardoner and Frere*; *Wit and Folly* = *Dialogue on Wit and Folly*; *Weather* = *Play of the Weather*; *Love* = *Play of Love*; *Four PP* = *Foure PP*. I have used the following texts:

John: A. BRANDL, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker* (Strassburg, 1898), Vol. LXXX, pp. 259-80.

Pardoner: F. J. CHILD, *Four Old Plays* (Cambridge, 1848), pp. 89-123.

Wit and Folly: F. W. FAIRHOLT, *Percy Society Publications*, Vol. XX.

Love: A. BRANDL, *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. LXXX, pp. 159-209.

Weather: *Ibid.*, pp. 211-57.

Four PP: J. M. MANLY, *Specimens of Pre-Shaksperian Drama* (Boston, 1897), Vol. I, pp. 483-522.

² Fr. *farce* < Lat. *facire*. Fr. *farce* originally meant "a thing that fills or stuffs." In cooking, *farce* meant a hash or minced material used for filling roasted fowls or pie-crusts. In liturgies *farce* was an interpolation or paraphrase, as may be seen from a direction in an old ceremonial, "Le Kyrie Eleison se chantera aux jours de fête avec *farce*." Cf. L. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *La comédie et les mœurs en France au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1886), p. 52.

³ THOMAS SIBILET, *Art poétique* (Paris, 1555), Livre II, chap. viii, p. 60.

must be brief, free from *la prolixité ennuyeuse*; it has no acts and scenes, little complication, and ordinarily treats only one comic incident. The one incident is taken from bourgeois life, and is treated with all possible comic and, generally, indecent realism. Again, we are not to expect in farce the well-known types of Latin comedy. We may define "farce," then, as a dramatic treatment of a single comic incident from bourgeois life, presented realistically, and free from moral or didactic tendency and from Latin imitation.

As a type following the definition worked out above, farce did not exist in England. A few sporadic cases can be cited, but on the basis of these no one has tried to establish a living native farce type in England.¹ The only early English plays that conform to the definition are *Secunda Pastorum*² of the Towneley Miracle Plays, Heywood's *John, Pardoner*, and to some extent *Four PP.*³ *Gammer Gurton's Needle* would perhaps conform to the type but for the pronounced Vice characteristics of Diccon. *Jack Juggler* and *Thersites* are obviously under direct Latin influence. Early English plays are, of course, full of farcical action and farcical situations, but in most cases the farcical element is only fragmentary and is overshadowed by allegory, didacticism, or religious purpose.⁴

¹ PROFESSOR C. M. GAYLEY's *Representative English Comedies* (New York, 1903) had not been published when this article was written. PROFESSOR GAYLEY says (*Representative English Comedies*, p. lxi): "I am inclined therefore to look upon the dramatized anecdotes assigned to Heywood as lucky survivals of a form which, since it had long been cultivated both in England and France, may have attained to a degree of excellence before he took it up." Professor Gayley advances no evidence for an independent farce type in England, and leaves the discussion of French relations to Mr. A. W. Pollard (cf. *Representative English Comedies*, pp. 3-17). For HEYWOOD's *Pardoner and Frere* and *Johan Johan the husbände* Mr. Pollard finds French parallels in the *Farce nouvelle d'un pardonneur, d'un triacleur et d'une taverniere* and the *Farce nouvelle de Pernet qui va au vin*. He mentions two passages parallel between HEYWOOD's *Johan Johan* and the *Farce nouvelle de Pernet*, points out the general similarity of *Pardoner and Frere* and *Farce nouvelle d'un pardonneur*, but withholds conclusions as to Heywood's borrowing. Neither Professor Gayley nor Mr. Pollard mentions the parallel to *Dialogue on Wit and Folly* in the French *Dylogue du fol et du sage*.

² An attempt has been made to establish the French *Farce de Patelin* as the source of *Secunda Pastorum*. Cf. K. SCHAUMBURG, *La farce de Patelin et ses imitations*, traduit par L. E. CHEVALDIN (Paris, 1889), pp. 158-76.

³ Perhaps the fragment *Interludium de clerico et puella* (T. WRIGHT, *Reliquiae Antiquae* [London, 1845], Vol. I, pp. 145-47) might be included in this list. The extant fragment seems to suggest an interlocutory version of a *fabliau*.

⁴ Cf. *Noah's Flood* of the Chester Miracle Plays, and the action of Ismael and Dalila in *Nice Wanton*.

From the standpoint of previous biblical and moral plays, and of subsequent Latinized plays, Heywood's *John* is impossible to classify.¹ Its realistic and unprejudiced treatment of a bit of bourgeois scandal seems to have no direct developmental relation to preceding and surrounding English drama. To one coming, however, from a study of the body of French farces of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, *John* causes no surprise, but appears merely as one more example of a well-known type. When we seek a parallel for *John* in this French material, we seem to be directly rewarded in the French farce *De Pernet qui va au vin*.² For purposes of clearness, let us outline the action of the two farces under consideration.³

John runs as follows:

In the absence of his wife, Tyb, John complains aloud of her gadding, suspects that she is with the priest, Sir John, and plans to beat her when she returns. Tyb enters in time to hear his threat and boldly dares him to execute it. In the presence of his wife John is entirely humbled, but as she expatiates upon the goodness of the priest, Sir John, he reiterates in interrupted undertones his suspicion of the priest. Tyb brings with her a pie in the making of which Sir John has collaborated, and suggests that her husband fetch the priest to join them in eating it. Reluctantly the husband sets off on the hated errand. After some hypocritical remonstrance, Sir John consents to come, and as they return together John tries to extract from the priest damaging evidence of his relations with Tyb. When the two men arrive, John notices a suspicious familiarity between his wife and the priest, but Tyb hushes him up and sets him to preparing the dinner. That she may flirt with Sir John, Tyb sends her husband for water, and when he returns in haste and suspicion, he brings an empty pail due to a leak purposely made by Tyb herself. Tyb and Sir John now devise the admirable scheme of setting the henpecked husband to chafing wax at the fire in order to stop the leak. While John

¹ This impossibility, so far as morality-plays are concerned, will appear below when we discuss Swoboda's thesis in detail.

² E. VIOLETT LE DUC, *Ancien théâtre français* (Paris, 1854-57), Tome I, pp. 195-211.

³ Ward (A. W. WARD, *History of English Dramatic Literature* [London, 1899], Vol. I, p. 244, footnote) mentions a resemblance between *Pernet* and *John*. Dr. Lester (J. A. LESTER, *Connections between the Drama of France and Great Britain, Particularly in the Elizabethan Period* [Unpublished Dissertation (H. U., 90, 456), Harvard University, 1900], Vol. I, pp. 13-15) to some extent investigates Ward's suggestion. In addition to quoting two parallel passages, he points out merely that the disturber of domestic peace in *Pernet* is L'Amoureux, and not a priest as in Heywood's play, and that the latter play shows superior motivation. As to dates, manuscripts, technical detail, further verbal parallels, and literary relations, Dr. Lester makes no suggestions.

reluctantly toils at the fire, Sir John and Tyb eat up the pie, flirt, and tell ribald stories. When John's patience is exhausted, a scuffle ensues, and the lovers leave the stage followed by the angry husband.

Pernet runs thus:

A Lover meets *Pernet's* wife and makes love to her. She invites him to visit her. *Pernet* enters in time to see the departing Lover, who has the wit to take affectionate leave of the Wife by calling her "Cousine." *Pernet* suspiciously inquires concerning this unknown kinsman, and is finally more or less convinced of Cousin's genuineness. When Cousin calls to see the Wife, *Pernet* pretends to receive him as a kinsman, but strongly suspects his familiarity. Since Cousin suggests wine, the Wife urges *Pernet* to fetch it. After much fuss as to the particular alehouse from which to get it, *Pernet* sets off reluctantly and full of suspicion. Cousin informs *Pernet* of a chicken pie that he may share, if he will only go for the wine. In the husband's absence, Cousin actively demonstrates his affection for the Wife, and the lovers are all but caught by *Pernet* who suspiciously returns for some forgotten trifle. When the wine arrives, the lovers begin their meal. To get *Pernet* out of the way, they set him to chafing wax at the fire, telling him that by so doing he will accomplish a "subtil ouvrage" which will bring him protection and riches.

At this point the play breaks off abruptly. Indeed, the latter part of the play is so bald and abrupt in construction that one easily accepts the suggestion that "le texte est mutilé."¹

With the two plays before us, we may, in the first place, notice certain differences.

1. The lover in *Pernet* is Cousin, alias Amoureux; in *John* he is Sir John, the priest.

2. In *Pernet* the husband is sent for wine; in *John* he goes for water.

3. In *Pernet* Amoureux is imposed upon the husband as being a kinsman; in *John* Tyb calls the priest merely her "good friend."

¹L. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Repertoire du théâtre comique en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1886), p. 213. The last eight lines of the play suggest such mutilation:

PERNET: "C'est ung très povre passetemps
De chauffer la cire quant on digne
Regardez; elle est plus molle que laine
En la chauffant rien n'aqueste.
COUSIN: "Conclus et conquete;
Avec la femme je banqueste
Combien que je ne sois le sire,
Et son mary chauffe la cire."

—*Ancien théâtre français*, Tome I, p. 211.

The abruptness of transition between these two concluding speeches seems palpably to suggest a loss of part of the text.

4. In *Pernet* the chafing of the wax is motivated only by the absurd idea of "subtil ouvrage;" in the English play the husband chafes wax in order to mend the leaky pail.

5. The English play ends with a scuffle; the French play seems to end with a submission of the husband. The real ending of the French play is probably lost.

It will probably be admitted by all that these differences are not of great consequence. At any rate, they are too slight to effect a difference between the plays in action, in the relations of characters to one another, or in the general types of the characters themselves.

On the other hand, similarities between the plays are striking:

1. Each play is a perfect example of what in France was called *farce*.

2. The plays treat the same well-established type of farce, namely, that in which occur the wife, the lover, and the hen-pecked, cuckolded husband.

3. Both plays are conventional in the husband's suspicious inquiring concerning the third person.

4. The husband in both plays is made to go reluctantly to get beverage for his hated guest.

5. In both plays the lovers eat a pie and give no share of it to the husband.

6. The lovers in the two plays show the same suspicious familiarity.

7. Most striking of all, in both plays the device for diverting the husband's attention is the very unusual one of chafing wax at the fire.

Since, then, the farce spirit, the action, the setting, the characters, the character relations, and the particular devices are so strikingly similar in two plays, we are justified in looking for still more definite relations.

When we approach the text itself, we notice that Heywood's play is more than twice as long as *Pernet*. Moreover, we must bear in mind that the text of the French farce is probably mutilated, and that portions of Heywood's play no longer paralleled in *Pernet* may have existed in the original French version. For

example, it is noteworthy that the French text breaks off abruptly just after the husband has been put to chafing wax, whereas Heywood makes a third of his play from what follows this situation. Since this situation of the lovers dining convivially while the husband ludicrously toils at the fire is quite ideal for farce treatment, we may easily believe that the writer of *Pernet* must have developed the situation along somewhat the lines of the last third of Heywood's play.

Waiving such probabilities for the moment, and comparing the two texts as we have them, we may note the following parallel passages:

John.

Ia. "Mary I chafe the waxe here
And I ymagyn to make you
good chere
That a vengauce take you
both as ye sit
For I know well I shall not
ete a byt
But yet in feyth yf I might
ete one morsell
I wolde thynk the matter went
very well."¹

b. "I chafe the wax
And I chafe it so hard that
my fyngers brakkes
.
.
.
And yet I dare not say one word
And they sit laughyng yender
at the bord."²

IIa. "Cokkes soule what have we here
As far as I sawe he drewe very
nere
Unto my wyfe."⁴

b. "Cokkes soule loke howe he ap-
procheth nere
Unto my wyfe, this abateth my
my chere."⁵

Pernet.

"Me faut-il donc chauffer le cire
Tandisque vous banqueterez
Corbieu, j'en suis marry:
Je crois ce pasté est bon."³

"Que l'ennemy d'enfer l'emporte
De me femme il est trop pri-
vé."⁶

¹ *John*, ll. 493-98.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 509 ff.

³ *Ancien théâtre français*, Tome I, p. 210.

⁴ *John*, ll. 441-43.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 431, 432.

⁶ *Ancien théâtre français*, Tome I, p. 204.

- IIIa. "Truely Johan Johan we made a pye
I and my gossyp Margery.
The preest payde for the stuffe
and the makyng
And Margery she payde for
bakyng."¹
- b. "The pye that was made I have
it nowe here
And therwith I trust we shall
make good chere."²
- IV. "Set up the table and that by
and by
Nowe go thy waye, I go shortly."⁴
- V. "But howe say you Syr John
Was it good your pie."⁶
- VI. "By the good lorde, this is a
pyteous warke
.
And I am Johan Johan which
must stande by pe fyre
Chafyng the wax and dare none
other wyse do."⁸
- "J'ay faict mettre ung chappon
en pasté
Dea cousin, mais n'arrestez
point.
C'est assez pour venir au point
Puisqu'on paye le banqueter.
Je n'ay plus garde d'arres-
ter."³
- "Faictes bouter la nappe
Je reviendray tantost du vin."⁵
- "Beuvez-en, il est bon et frais
Est-il bon, cousin."⁷
- "C'est ung tres povre passe-
temps
De chauffer (la) cire quant on
digne."⁹

As mere verbal parallels by themselves, these passages seem to me of slight importance. Several passages plainly show identity of particulars in the two plays, but it is needless to say that such parallels alone could not prove interdependence. Supported by the striking similarities of incident already noticed, these parallels do seem to contribute a small amount of evidence.

As to the date of *Pernet* we know only the statement of the colophon, "Imprimé nouvellement, 1548."¹⁰ Of earlier editions

¹ *John*, II. 157-62.

² *Ibid.*, II. 185, 186.

³ *Ancien théâtre français*, Tome I, p. 209.

⁴ *John*, II. 262, 263.

⁵ *An. th. fr.*, I, p. 209.

⁶ *John*, I. 593.

⁷ *An. th. fr.*, I, p. 210.

⁸ *John*, II. 595, 606-8.

⁹ *An. th. fr.*, I, p. 211.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

we know nothing. This date, however, raises no difficulty in the way of direct borrowing by the English play from the French, for there is nothing to disprove an edition of *Pernet* earlier than 1520-30,¹ and the word *nouvellement* of the colophon, and the fact that most French farces were written in the fifteenth century, seem to point to such an early edition.

From the following considerations: (1) similarity in type, incident, characterization, and details of device and action; (2) verbal parallels, suggesting that certain English passages are reminiscences of the French; (3) the probable dates of the two plays; (4) the abundant opportunities for transference to England of French dramatic ideas;² (5) the isolation of the two or three farces known in English; (6) the absence of any positive objection to Heywood's borrowing from French—from these considerations I conclude that Heywood knew the French farce *Pernet* in some form, and borrowed from it at least the plot, type, characters, and main incidents of *John*. That Heywood treated his model (in the form in which we know it) with freedom and improved upon it in motivation, delicacy of characterization, and niceness of sequence, does not at all invalidate the original obligation.

In connection with Heywood's *Pardoner* we are especially struck at the outset by his generous verbal borrowings from Chaucer. An exhaustive enumeration of passages has been made elsewhere,³ and for our present purpose one illustrative passage will suffice:

¹ The probable date of *John*; cf. SWOBODA, pp. 28-34.

² I refer to such circumstances as:

a) Political negotiations.

b) Diplomatic entertainments. Cf. J. PARDOE, *Court and Reign of Francis I.*, 2 vols. (London, 1849), Vol. I, pp. 290-94; R. HOLINSHED, *Chronicle*, 6 vols. (London, 1808), Vol. III, pp. 634 ff.; P. PARIS, *Études sur François Ier*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1885), Vol. I, p. 51; MICHAUD ET POUJOULAT, *Mémoires à l'histoire de France*, Première Série (Paris, 1838), Vol. V, pp. 69-71; E. HALL, *Chronicle* (London, 1809), pp. 723, 724; G. CAVENDISH, *Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (London, 1877), p. 201.

c) French players in England in the period 1485-1530. Cf. J. P. COLLIER, *English Dramatic Poetry* (London, 1879), Vol. I, pp. 48 ff.; B. TEN BRINK, *History of English Literature* (London, 1896), Vol. II, Part 2, p. 123.

d) Literary visits. Cf. *Revue contemporaine*, Première Série, Vol. XXI, pp. 42 ff.; A. MAURY, *Journal des savants*, September, 1887, p. 528.

³ W. SWOBODA, *Wiener Beiträge*, Vol. III, pp. 63 ff.

CHAUCER: *Pardoner's Prologue.*

"First I pronounce whennes that
 I come
 And than my bulles shewe I, alle
 and somme
 Our lige lordes seel on my
 patente
 That shewe I first, my body to
 warente
 That no man be so bold, ne
 preest ne clerk
 Me to destourbe of Cristes
 holy werk."¹

Pardoner.

"But first ye shall know well, yt I
 com fro Rome
 To here my bulles, all and some
 Our lyege lorde seale here on my
 patent
 I bere with me, my body to
 warant;
 That no man be so bolde, be he,
 preest or clarke,
 Me to dysturbe of Chrystes
 holy werke."²

This parallel and those given by Swoboda are, of course, quite conclusive as to Heywood's direct indebtedness to Chaucer for the *Pardoner's* introductory speech in the play. It is noteworthy, however, that the dialogue and construction of the play itself could not come from Chaucer. Noteworthy also is the fact that this play conforms entirely to our definition of "farce" as treating realistically and without moral or didactic purpose a single comic incident from bourgeois life. The spirit of the play is entirely that of French farce, and the character types are thoroughly common in the French genre. Again we are justified, then, in searching in the rich collection of French farces for possible parallel's to Heywood's *Pardoner*.

Our search is rewarded in the farce *D'un pardonneur, d'un triacleur, et d'une taverniere*.³

The action of the French farce may be outlined as follows:

The Pardonneur, laden with relics, begins his bombastic appeals in a public place. The Triacleur (traveling apothecary) enters with his simples and starts an opposition of talking and selling. The two fakirs carry on their talk in alternate short speeches, mixing into the advertisement of their wares curses and ridicule for each other. At the end they decide to become temporarily reconciled in order to visit the tavern together. They leave a precious relic as payment to the barmaid.

The action of Heywood's *Pardoner and Friar* runs somewhat parallel, as follows:

¹ W. W. SKEAT, *Student's Chaucer* (London, 1900), p. 556.

² F. J. CHILD, *Four Old Plays* (Cambridge, 1848), p. 94.

³ E. VIOLETT LE DUC, *Ancien théâtre Français* (Paris, 1854-57), Tome II, pp. 50 ff.

The Friar, in or before the church, begins a pious speech to the congregation. While he is praying, the Pardoner enters to declare himself and his relics. The two then try to carry on sermons simultaneously, the result being much interruption and cursing of each other. At the end they fall to blows, and are separated by the curate and neighbor Pratt.

Direct and literal borrowing on Heywood's part from the French farce is entirely out of the question, since both the characters and action in the two plays are far different. Verbal parallels are utterly lacking.

Although Heywood is not indebted to this particular play for his *dramatic material*, we are still allowed to contend that this French farce, or a similar farce now lost, provided the *type* for *Pardoner*. That the plays are identical in type cannot be denied. Each is a pure farce, treating the meeting and ludicrous opposition of two well-known characters of late mediæval satire. Each play is absolutely free from any purpose or material foreign to the farce genre. No play similar to *Pardoner* exists in England, either in text or by title. The Pardoner's passage at the beginning of the play and the general conceptions of the Pardoner and the Friar, all from Chaucer, do not account for the whole play. Swoboda seems to have the same notion in saying: "Die Charaktere des Friars und der beiden Pardoner sind zwar Chaucer entlehnt, aber die Idee, die zwei in den *Canterbury Tales* getrennten Personen dramatisch zusammengebracht zu haben, ist Heywoods."¹

In estimating how far this idea "ist Heywoods," one must bear in mind two considerations. In the first place, those who have discussed the relations of this play to Chaucer² seem to me to overlook the dramatic action in Chaucer's own text. The Friar and Sompnour in the *Canterbury Tales* have exactly the attitude toward each other that we find between the Friar and Pardoner in Heywood's play. Moreover, not only does each tell a tale aimed against the other, but each interrupts the other in an entirely dramatic manner.³ Therefore already in Chaucer we

¹ W. SWOBODA, p. 75.

² W. SWOBODA, *Wiener Beiträge*, Vol. III; A. BRANDL, *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. LXXX; F. J. CHILD, *Four Old Plays* (Cambridge, 1848).

³ Cf. the opening part of the *Friar's Tale* and of the *Sompnour's Tale*, and the Prologue of each.

have two characters "dramatisch zusammengebracht." The substitution on Heywood's part of the Pardoner for the Sompnour is perhaps easily explained by the fact that the former with his relics provides better "stage business" and more farcical fun, and by the fact that he must have been a character much better known in actual life and literature. In the second place, Heywood must have known French farce as a genre, and not improbably the particular French farce before us.¹

Therefore, since already in Chaucer were prepared, not only the dramatic material, but also a few suggestions for action, and since a French farce existed providing not only action following precisely the general lines of the English play, but also the precise type, therefore Heywood's originality in this play is slight.

I conclude that Heywood took much of his dramatic material from Chaucer, and probably found his dramatic model in the French *Farce d'un pardonneur*, or in a similar farce now lost.

Concerning Heywood's *Dialogue on Wit and Folly* Collier says that the author

may also, perhaps, deserve credit as the inventor of this species of dramatic entertainment—though dramatic chiefly in the circumstances that it was conducted in dialogue, and it was merely a discussion in verse between two or more characters on some particular topic or opinion.² In how far Heywood may be called an "inventor of this species" will appear more clearly as we proceed.

As to the sources of Heywood's *Dialogue*, no suggestion has been made except by Brandl, who notices that the general theme of *Wit and Folly* is that of Erasmus's *Encomium Moriae*, namely, "Better be a fool than wise."³ That Heywood knew Erasmus's work is certain, for it is said to have been written in the house of Thomas More⁴ and is dedicated to him, and More was almost surely the patron of John Heywood.⁵

¹ Cf. p. 11 above, footnote 3, and cf. p. 23 below.

² COLLIER, Vol. II, p. 307.

³ A. BRANDL, *loc. cit.*, p. xlix: "Er (Heywood) verhielt sich ungefähr wie Erasmus, dessen 'Adagia' (1500) ihn wohl zu den Proverbs anregten und dessen 'Encomium Moriae' (1509) deutlich anklingt wenn Heywood in seinem 'Dialogue' die These erörtert, der Narr sei besser daran als der Gescheidte." Brandl does not pursue his suggestion farther.

⁴ T. E. BRIDGETT, *Life of Sir Thomas More* (London, 1891), p. 456.

⁵ BRANDL, *loc. cit.*

Before making concrete comparisons between Heywood's *Wit and Folly* and Erasmus's *Encomium Moriae*, let us examine the general outline of the former.

James insists to John that it is better to be foolish than wise, since, while the fool is provided for, the wise man must toil for his living. But, says John, a fool is bullied about and "lugged by the eares" and is subject to painful emotions from trivial causes. Yes, says James, but consider the pain suffered by the wise man who earns his living and must endure also the mental agony of thought and study. From mental and bodily pain the fool is free. But, says John, as the wise man's pain is greater, so also is his pleasure greater. No, says James, since a fool is certain of the greatest of all pleasures, namely salvation, whereas the wise man may gain this pleasure only by painful and correct living. Having convinced John of the superiority of foolishness, James leaves his part in the discussion to Jerome, who reinstates wisdom by showing that, since a wise man is better than a beast, and since a fool is a beast, therefore a wise man is better than a fool.

When we turn to *Encomium Moriae*, we find many of the ideas used by Heywood in *Wit and Folly*.

Concerning the pleasure of foolishness we find in Erasmus such pertinent passages as the following:

Principio quis nescit primam hominis aetatem multo laetissimam, multoque omnibus gratissimam esse?¹ . . . An vero aliud est puerum esse quam delirare, quam desipere? An non hoc vel maxime in ea delectat aetate, quod nihil sapit?²

Sed dicant mihi per Jovem, quae tandem vitae pars est, non tristis, non infestiva, non invenusta, non insipida, non molesta, nisi voluptatem, id est, stultitiae condimentum adjunxeris? Cujus rei cum satis idoneus testis esse possit, ille nunquam satis laudatus Sophocles, cujus extat pulcherrimum illud de nobis elogium, ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μὴδὲν ἡδιστος βίος.³

Concerning the mental pain Heywood writes:

And further, meane labor in most comon wyse,
Ys most parte hansome, and holsome excercyse,
That purgythe hewmors to mans lyfe and quyckness,
Whyche study bredythe to mans dethe or sycknes,
Also, most kynds of labor most comenly
Strene most grose owtewarde parts of the body;
Wher study, sparyng sholders, fyngers, and tose,
To the hedd and hart dyrectly study gose.

¹ DES. ERASMI, *Stultitiae Laus*, ed. GUIL. GOTTL. BECKERI (Basileae, 1780), p. 33.

² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 33.

Pervert ys your jugment yf ye judge not playne,
 That less ys the parell, and les ys the payne
 The knockyng of knockylls whyche fyngers dothe strayne,
 Then dyggyng yn the hart, or drying of the brayne.¹

On the same topic Erasmus has the following:

An non videtis tetricos istos et vel philosophiae studiis, vel seriis et arduis addictos negotiis plerumque priusquam plane juvenes sint, jam consensuisse, videlicet curis, et assidua acrique cogitationum agitatione sensim spiritus et succum illum vitalem exhauriente? Cum contra Moriones mei pinguculi sint, et nitidi, et bene curata cute.²

As to the treatment a fool receives, John says:

Who cometh by the sott who cometh he by
 That vexythe hymn not some way usewally
 Some beat hym, some bob hym
 Some joll him, some job hym,
 Some tugg hym by the hers,
 Some lugg hym by the eares, etc.³

Erasmus apparently implies the same sort of treatment, when he says:

Si saxum in caput incidat, id vere malum fit. Caeterum pudor, infamia, probrum maledicta, tantum adferunt noxae, quantum sentiuntur. Si sensus absit, ne mala quidem sunt. Quid laedit, si totus populus in te sibilet, modo tute tibi plaudas.⁴

As to disquietude of mind James says:

Tak yt how ye lyst, ye can mak yt no les,
 But wytty have suche payne as my words wyttnes
 For thowgh wytt for tyme sometyme may payne prevent
 Yet yn most tymes theyr foreseyd payne ys present
 Whyche payne in the wytty wyttyly weyde,
 May match payne of the wyttles by ye fyrst leyd;
 And to the second point for dystemporatt joyes,
 By havyng or hoppyng of fancyes or toyes,
 In wyttles or wytty bothe tak I as one,
 Ffor though the thyngs that wytty have or hope on,
 Are yn some kynd of acownt; thyngs mucche gretter
 Then thyngs of the sotts joyings, yet no whyt better,
 Nor les payne bryngth that passhyon, but endyferent
 To bothe, except wytty have the woors turment.⁵

¹ F. W. FAIRHOLT, *Percy Society Publications*, Vol. XX, pp. 9, 10.

² *Stultitiae Laus*, pp. 40, 41.

⁴ *Stultitiae Laus*, p. 113.

³ FAIRHOLT, p. 2.

⁵ FAIRHOLT, p. 6.

On this same point we find in Erasmus:

Est ne quicquam felicius isto hominum genere, quos vulgo moriones, stultos, fatuos ac bliteos appellant, pulcherrimis, ut equidem opinor, cognominibus? . . . Principio vacant mortis metu, non mediocri, per Jovem, malo. Vacant conscientiae carnificina non territantur manium fabulamentis. Non expavescunt spectris ac lemurbus, non torquentur metu impendentium malorum, non spe futurorum bonorum distenduntur.¹

James's chief argument for the fool's superiority is his certainty of salvation:

But for a meane betwene bothe, my self strayght schall
Alege not plesewrs all I sey, but such one
As over weythe other plesewrs every chone:
Whych plesewre wher yt in fyne dothe not remayne,
All plesewrs in all parts ar plesewrs but vayne
Of whyche one plesewre the wyttles are sewre evyr
And of that plesewre, wytty are sewr nevyr!

JOHN: What plesewr ys that?

JAMES: Plesewr of salvashyon!

And the state of sotts have none acownt so carnall
That God ympewtethe any yll to them I say.²

On this point Erasmus says:

Denique si propius etiam ad brutorum animantium insipientiam, accesserint, ne peccant quidem autoribus theologis. Hic mihi jam expendas velim, stultissime sapiens, quot undique solitudinibus noctes diesque discrutietur animus tuus, congeras in unum acervum universa vitae tuae incommoda, atque ita demum intelliges, quantis malis meos fatuos subduxerim. Adde huc, quod non solum ipsi perpetuo gaudent, ludunt, cantillant, rident, verumetiam caeteris omnibus quocunque sese verterint, voluptatem, jocum, lusum, risumque adferunt, velut in hoc ipsum a Deorum indulgentia dati, ut humanae vitae tristitiam exhilararent . . . impune permittant quicquid vel dixerint, vel fecerint . . . sunt enim vere sacri Diis.³

From these particular instances we see that a number of Heywood's ideas are already stated in *Encomium Moriae*.

Through surprising oversight in connection with Heywood's *Wit and Folly*, no one has mentioned a striking French parallel in the somewhat obscure *Dyalogue du fol et du sage*.⁴ The ideas in the French dialogue are as follows:

¹ *Stultitiae Laus*, pp. 126, 127. ² FAIRHOLT, pp. 13, 14, 16. ³ *Stultitiae Laus*, pp. 128, 129.

⁴ Printed in *Les Joyeusetez Faceries et Folastres Imaginacions*, "Techener Libraire," Vol. XIV, No. 3 (Paris, 1833).

The wise man, regretting his former days of folly, determines to seek the pleasure, peace, wealth, and honor that belong to wisdom. The fool objects that with wisdom come only care and unrest. Wisdom brings wealth to be sure, but also the fear of losing it. The fool need not fear losing what he does not possess. The fool may be mocked and maltreated, but such discomfiture is slight compared to the constant burdens of the wise man. In fact, since the fool can do nothing to disgrace himself, he of the two will always have the better reputation. With neither worry nor effort the fool inevitably attains the ease, peace, and honor of old age. Most important of all, the wise man by getting much money and setting his heart upon it is in danger of damnation, a danger from which the fool is entirely free.

Placing the two dialogues side by side, we notice that the main ideas in Heywood's *Wit and Folly* are these: (1) the wise man must toil while the fool need not; (2) the fool is mocked and maltreated; (3) the wise man suffers agonies of mind; (4) the wise man is in danger of damnation, while the fool is sure of salvation.

That each of these points is treated also in the French *Dyalogue* will appear from the following passages:

1. As to the wise man's toil and the fool's exemption we read:

SAGE: "Tu nauras escus ne ducatz
Et pourtant rends toy a sagesse."

FOL: "Oste le moy ie nen nay cure
Ce nest que tourment et trauail
Tantost a pied; puis a cheval
Ceste sagesse ne vaut rien."¹

FOL: "Iamais ie veis mourir de fain
Homme qui fut enuers Dieu mixte
He navons nous pas le psalmiste
Qui dist non vidit justum
Semen eius derelictum."²

2. As to the mocking and maltreatment of the fool we read:

SAGE: "Si tu ioues ce sera bien ioue
Tu en seras un peu loue
De quelque homme ou de quelque femme
Mais si tu faulx tu es infame
Chascun de toy se mocquera."³

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

3. As to the wise man's pain of mind we read:

SAGE: "Jauray mon plaisir corporel
Repos, soulas, et tout deduyt."

FOL: "Tu n'euz oncques un jour pareil
Depuis que mere te produyt.

.
Un riche a tousiours doubte et tremble
De paour que on luy emble le sien
Mais un pauvre homme qui na rien.
Iamais il ne craint le deschet
Car qui na rien rien ne luy chet."¹

4. As to the matter of salvation we read:

FOL: "Car si dargent tu faictz ton maistre
Je te tiens pour homme damne."²

.
FOL: "Si subjectir et asservir
Que on en iaissast de dieu servir
Ceulx la sont folz et non pas sages
Deulx est escript en maintz passage
Quilz sen vont a damnation."³

At this point it should be mentioned that the latter part of Heywood's *Wit and Folly*, in which wisdom is reinstated by Jerome, could be due to neither *Encomium Moriae* nor the French *Dyialogue*. This original addition of Heywood's illustrates the freedom with which he probably handled all his sources, and may perhaps be accounted for by his grasping an opportunity to display his dialectical cleverness, or, better still, by his desire to pay a compliment to Henry VIII. Near the end of the play occurs the stage remark, "Thes thre stav next folowyng in the Kyngs absens ar voyde,"⁴ after which follow four stanzas to the king. Such a compliment (and incidental begging⁵) would be much less artistically added if folly were to triumph. The very triumph of wisdom is turned into a compliment to Henry VIII.

From the foregoing parallel passages we conclude that either *Encomium Moriae* or the French *Dyialogue* might have furnished Heywood with his main ideas. No actual verbal parallels are

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 29.

² *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁴ FAIRHOLT, p. 27.

⁵ *Idem*, p. 28, "I hartly wyshe for encrease of rewardes."

noticeable between Heywood's play and either the French or the Latin work. Since either *Encomium Moriae* or the French *Dyialogue* is capable of supplying Heywood with his main ideas, what are the external chances for his use of each? That he must have known *Encomium Moriae* we have already established.¹ The editors of the French play remark:

Ce petit dialogue fut probablement représenté sous la règne de Louis XII, et peutêtre en présence de sa cour, comme les vers suivants semblent le faire entendre:

Si iestois sage et toy aussi
Et nous ne serions pas icy
Pour faire tous les seigneurs rire.²

If, then, this *Dyialogue* was a court production for Louis XII, the avenue between Heywood and the play is almost direct. In 1514 Henry VIII and his sister, Mary, visited the court of Louis XII, and soon after Mary and Louis XII were married. As to the dramatic entertainments offered during this visit no documents are available, but at least here is a perfect connection between the court where the French *Dyialogue* is said to have been produced and the court where Heywood was doing his dramatic work. That the train returning with Henry VIII and Mary should have brought to England dramatic ideas from the French court is entirely probable. Most important of all is the fact that whereas *Encomium Moriae* provides the ideas, but no suggestion for a dialogue form, this French *Dyialogue* offers not only the ideas, but also a precisely similar dialogue form.

With these facts before us we may safely conclude:

1. That Heywood certainly knew *Encomium Moriae*, and may have taken from it some general ideas.
2. That an exact analogue to Heywood's play existed in France in the period 1498-1515.
3. That the external circumstances provide an avenue between Heywood and this French play.
4. That, considering its form and material, the French *Dyialogue* is the most satisfactory source for Heywood's *Wit and Folly*.

Bearing in mind the possible French relations of at least three of Heywood's plays, let us return to a detailed criticism of

¹ Cf. p. 13 above.

² *Les Joyeusetez*, etc., p. v.

Swoboda's thesis regarding the genealogy of Heywood's plays as a whole. After stating his main thesis and purpose of explaining Heywood's plays as "legitime Nachkommen der Moralitäten,"¹ the writer supports his theory by a detailed examination of a number of aspects of these plays. I propose to give Swoboda's own statement of each separate point, with such criticism of each as may be suggested by my previous examination of Heywood's relations to French material.

1. "Die Personen der Moralitäten waren allegorische Figuren gewesen, die abstracte Eigenschaften, Laster, Tugenden, Gemuthszustände u. A. vorstellten. Betrachten wir zunächst das *Play of Love*. Es handelt von dem Einfluss der allmächtigen Leidenschaft der Liebe auf das menschliche Gemüth und zeigt die Leiden und Freuden, die sie dem Menschen bringt. Das geschieht im modernen Lustspiel auch, aber es zeigt den allgemeinen Gedanken an einem concreten Falle. Das *Play of Love* lässt aber den allgemeinen Satz durch Personen vorführen, die als solche nicht menschliche Wesen von Fleisch und Blut sind, die die Sympathie oder Antipathie des Zuhörers herausfordern. Der geliebte Liebhaber ist nicht dieser oder jener, sondern der Liebhaber in abstracto Aehnliches gilt von dem *Play of Weather*. . . . Den Personen ansich kommt kein charakteristisches Merkmal zu. Sie sind also auch blos abstract."²

This abstractness of characterization can be found in only *two* of Heywood's *six* plays. Moreover, since these two plays, *Love* and *Weather*, are in type genuine *débats*, their abstractness of characterization should probably be traced to the mediæval *débat*, from which they directly descended, rather than to English morality-plays.

2. Noch entschiedener als in diesem Punkte macht sich der Einfluss der Moralitäten mit Bezug auf ihre didaktische Tendenz geltend.

Dies ist der Fall im *Wetterspiel*, im *Liebesspiel*, den *Four P's* und *Wit and Folly*. Aber nicht mehr in gleichem Masse ist die lehrhafte Absicht mit der Structur der Stücke verwachsen. Das Interlude von den *Vier P* oder das *Liebesspiel* könnte auch ohne die Schlussmoral bestehen, nicht so jedoch ein *Moral play*. Das Spiel vom Wetter trägt den Stempel des Lehrhaften am deutlichsten. . . . Was ist die Ursache dieses zähen Festhaltens an einem ganz undramatischen Princip? Warum hat sich John Heywood nicht auch in diesen Stücken von dieser Fessel losgemacht, wie in dem *Ablasskrämer* und *Mönch* und dem *Hahnrei*-

¹ Cf. above, p. 2.

² SWOBODA, p. 56.

spiel?¹ Theils hatte der Dichter selbst eine starke Neigung zum Lehrhaften, theils stand er unter dem Drucke der Gewohnheit, so dass diese moralisirenden Schlüsse als eine Concession an den Zeitgeschmack betrachtet werden müssen.²

In view of our previous study of French relations, may we not answer Swoboda's own question less feebly? In *John and Pardoner* Heywood is "von dieser Fessel losgemacht," because in these two plays he is dealing with the French farce type, a type which deals with pure comic bourgeois realism and to which "didaktische Tendenz" and "Neigung zum Lehrhaften" are utterly foreign. This confessed weakness of Swoboda's theory is apparently entirely met by our opposing theory of French farce influence.

3. Das Hauptmotiv aller *Interludes* von John Heywood ist Zank und Streit. . . . Das Thema des Streites ist meist ein abstracter Satz. In *Wit and Folly* handelt es sich darum, "ob es besser sei, ein Narr oder ein Weiser zu sein," im *Loveplay* "ob es besser sei zu lieben und geliebt zu werden, oder nicht," im *Weatherplay* wird nachgewiesen, dass "der Menschen Wünsche unvereinbar seien." In *Pardoner and Friar* und *The Four P's* handelt es sich schon um etwas mehr Greifbares, nämlich den Werth verschiedener Seelenrettungsmethoden. Auch ist in beiden der Streit durch den Brotheid motivirt. Das concreteste Streitobject ist aber die Pastete im Hahnreispiel. Je concreter das Streitobject, desto grösser wird das Interesse des Zuhörers sein. Der Streit um die abstracten Sätze der drei erstgenannten Stücke wird uns weniger interessiren als der in den zwei folgenden. Das beste Stück in dieser Beziehung ist daher das Hahnreispiel.

* * * * *

Das Streitmotiv, sowie die ganze Art seiner dramatischen Entwicklung ist eine Erbschaft der Moralitäten. Aber auch die Moralitäten standen in dieser Beziehung unter französischem Einfluss. . . . Das Streitmotiv der Moralitäten und seine ganze juristisch-casuistische Durchführung ist gelehrten Ursprungs. Schon im 13. Jahrhundert waren in Frankreich neben den Mysterien und Mirakeln Spiele rein profaner Natur gespielt worden, die ihren Streicharakter schon durch den Namen *Jus*, *Jeu* andeuten. Auch aus der Lyrik und Didaktik der Trouvères gingen dramatische Compositionen rein weltlicher Art hervor. Diese *Disputaisons* und *Débats* zeigen auch schon im Namen ihren Charakter. Die "Farcen der *Bazochiens* sind auch oft nichts weiter als ein witziger Wettstreit über irgend ein gegebenes Thema, in welchem

¹ Meaning *Pardoner* and *John*.

² SWOBODA, pp. 56, 57.

sich Witz und Humor mit juristischer Casuistik vereinte. Das Spiel *Pierre de la Broche qui dispute a Fortune par devant Reson* weist auf die *Disputaisons* der *Trouvères* zurück und auf die späteren *Querelles* wie *Moralités* fort.¹ Die *Moralités* aber beeinflussten ihrerseits das komische Interlude Heywoods. Das *Interlude Wit and Folly* zeigt den juristisch-casuistischen Charakter am einfachsten, reinsten und deutlichsten: es ist auch nichts Anderes als ein witziger Wettstreit über ein gegebenes Thema, in welchem sich Witz und Humor mit juristischer Casuistik vereinten.²

In clearing up this point, we must first contest the opening statement that "Das hauptmotiv aller *Interludes* von John Heywood ist zank und streit." Beyond doubt *Wit and Folly*, *Love*, and *Weather* are perfect examples of *streit*-plays. The action and interest of these plays lie entirely in the proposal and discussion of a debatable question. *Four PP* and especially *Pardoner* are not strictly *streit*-plays. Each opens with an amusing situation out of which arises an amusing discussion, and the comedy of the characters and their ludicrous situations are our main interest rather than the discussion of an abstract question. In saying, "Das concreteste streitobject is aber die pastete im hahnreispiegel," Swoboda surely falls into triviality. If *John* were to have a *streitmotiv* at all, it must surely be the cuckolding of John, not the mere incidental stage business of the pie. As a matter of fact, *John* has not the slightest vestige of *streitmotiv*, but is a little drama of bourgeois scandal in which occur cuckolding, henpecking, and, if someone insists, a pie! In other words, *John* is a perfect example of French farce, and need not be considered further under this part of Swoboda's argument.

After attributing to all Heywood's plays this characteristic of *streitmotiv*, Swoboda clumsily derives this *streitmotiv*, so far as Heywood is concerned, exclusively from morality-plays, explaining that the moralities had it as an inheritance from the lyric and didactic poetry of the *Trouvères*, from mediæval *disputaisons* and *débats*, and from such French farces as were "ein witziger wettstreit über irgend ein gegebenes thema." Even if we were to grant that English morality-plays derive their *débat* character-

¹ EBERT'S *Jahrbuch*, Vol. I, "Besprechung der *Études historiques sur les Clercs de la Bazoche*," pp. 235-40.

² SWOBODA, pp. 57-59.

istics in just this way, why need we take the next step and say that Heywood got his *débat* ideas from English morality-plays rather than from the original sources themselves? If *Love* and *Weather* are pure *débats* acted out in dramatic form, is it not reasonable to assume that they were inspired by contemporary and antecedent *débats* rather than merely by morality-plays? Since *Wit and Folly* is a perfect example of one type of French farce, and since a contemporary parallel is extant, the English play and the French play are probably related directly rather than through the medium of morality-plays.

Against Swoboda, then, I insist, in the first place, that "zank und streit" are not characteristics of Heywood plays as a whole; in the second place, that where "zank und streit" do occur they are not "eine erbschaft der moralitäten," but are directly related to the same elements in contemporary and antecedent *débats*, *disputaisons*, *jeus*, and *farces*.

4. Die Folge des starken Hervortretens von Streit, Zank und Disput ist, dass die Handlung der Moralitäten so gut wie die des komischen *Interludes* vom rhetorischen Wust überwuchert ist. *Wit and Folly* ist ganz rhetorisch und hat keinen andern Anspruch dramatisch zu heissen, als dass es die Form des Dialogs hat. Es ist ein "Gesprächsspiel." In beschränkterem Masse gilt dies auch von anderen *Interludes*. Das *Love-play*, das *Weatherplay*, *The Four P's* und auch *The Pardoner and Friar* bestehen zum grösseren Theile aus Reden. Die genaue, oft spitzfindige Abhandlung einer gegebenen Frage oder Behauptung, ihre Exemplification, die sichtliche Freude an dem Abwägen von Gründen und Gegengründen ist für die Moralitäten wie für das komische *Interlude* charakteristisch.¹

Wit and Folly, *Love*, and *Weather* are obviously overloaded with rhetorical and logical trash. Although *Four PP* and *Pardoner* are made up largely of *talk*, these plays are not overloaded "vom rhetorischen wust." The difference between the comic conversation of the latter plays and the dry hairsplitting of the former is in itself almost sufficient to distinguish two separate genres. Most striking of all is the fact that this characteristic does not in the least apply to *John*. This play, being free from "zank und streit," is also free from talk or rhetorical trash,

¹ SWOBODA, p. 59.

Here again Swoboda is apparently unaware that he is dealing with two genres. *John*, *Four PP*, and *Pardoner* take their comic dialogue from the farce tradition. *Love*, *Weather*, and *Wit and Folly* derive the dryness of their hairsplitting discussions from the *débat*.

5. Auch das erzählende Element nimmt, wie schon in den Mysterien und den Moralitäten, so auch in dem komischen Interlude einen verhältnissmässig zu grossen Raum ein. So ist *The Four P's* durch die langen Geschichten des Apothekers und des Ablasskrämers — vom dramatischen Standpunkt genommen — entstellt. Selbst das beste Stück Heywoods, die Hahnreicomödie, ist von dieser Unzukömmlichkeit nicht frei. Der Dichter hat es nicht über sich bringen können, uns die drei Wundercurgeschichten des Priesters zu ersparen. . . . Daraus sieht man, dass Heywoods Stärke in der Composition epischer Poesie, d. h. der versificirten komischen Erzählung lag.¹

Four PP is certainly guilty of a large narrative element. Perhaps, however, it is worth while to remark that in this play the narrative element consists in two stories of the *fabliau* type. Probably no one will try to maintain that *fabliaux* are characteristic of morality-plays. To attribute this narrative characteristic to Heywood's best piece, *John*, is surely to accentuate unfairly a very minor point. The narrative part is entirely contained in three small bits of dirty story that the priest mixes into his conversation to amuse the adulterous Tyb. Moreover, such a correspondence in a minor characteristic is at best slight evidence of organic relation between morality-play and pure French farce.

6. Zu den epischen Bestandtheilen des komischen *Interludes* gehören auch die Reiseberichte im *Weatherplay* und in *The Four P's*, die auch schon in den Mysterien und Moralitäten beliebt waren. Hierin spiegelt sich eine andere Richtung der Zeit, die Freude an Entdeckungen und Reisen.²

What "Reiseberichte" may mean as a vital characteristic of Heywood's plays is not apparent. Since the writer applies this characteristic to only two plays, and without illustration, we have no basis for interpretation.

7. Eine andere Eigenthümlichkeit, die ebenfalls aus dem Nachlass der Moralitäten stammt, ist die Figur des Lustigmachers, des *Vice* der *Moralplays*. In zwei Interludes kommt diese Persönlichkeit vor, in dem

¹ SWOBODA, pp. 59, 60.

² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

Weatherplay und dem *Loveplay*. Sie heisst zwar in jenem *Merry Report*, in diesem *Neither Lover nor Loved*, aber die Bühnenanweisungen bezeichnen ihn geradezu als *Vice*. In *The Four P's* trägt der Apotheker, in *John, the Husband* der Pantoffelheld John viele Züge des *Vice*, doch nicht mehr den Namen.¹

In regard to *Love* and *Weather* this observation is emphatically correct; also the Apothecary in *Four PP* certainly has *Vice* characteristics. Nevertheless, in spite of the presence of this stray morality-play characteristic, *Love* and *Weather* are clearly *débats*, and *Four PP* is closely related to French farce. In making a *Vice* of the husband in *John*, Swoboda is surely guilty of misconception. Were this play to have a *Vice*, Tyb, the wife, were certainly the only fair candidate for the office. With her malicious and comic spirit, she, and not the henpecked and gullible husband, is the moving evil genius of the play. As a matter of fact, however, *John* has no *Vice*, since in a pure farce no character is given a moral value. In *Pardoner* and *Wit and Folly* Swoboda very properly finds no vestige of *Vice*.

8. Die Art und Weise der Mysterien und *Moralplays*, die Handlung mit Anreden an das Publicum zu beginnen, findet sich in dem komischen *Interlude* wieder. Sowie zum Beispiel in der Moralität *Nature* die allegorische Figur des Stolzes (*Pride*) die Zuhörerschaft vor Beginn des Stückes anspricht, oder John Bale seine *Interludes* mit chorusartigen Reden als "prolocutor" einleitet, so wird auch Heywoods *Wetterspiel* mit einer ganz ähnlichen Anrede Jupiters eröffnet.

* * * * *

Im *Play of Love* richtet der unglückliche Liebhaber seine Klagen an die Zuschauer; die Predigt des Mönches in *The Pardoner and Friar* ist an die im *banqueting room* wirklich anwesende Gesellschaft gerichtet; ihr werden auch die Reliquien gezeigt; ihr gibt der Pilgrim in *The Four P's* seinen Reisebericht, bevor noch eine andere Person auf der Bühne ist.²

In the opinion of Ward, Ebert, and others,³ all these examples, except that in *Weather*, are mere monologues or dramatic soliloquies, no more addressed to the public than is any remark of an actor to himself. Even if Swoboda were right, the mere matter of prologue would probably furnish only a slight basis for vital relation between Heywood's plays and morality-plays.

¹ SWOBODA, p. 60.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 61.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

9. Auch die Schlüsse der *Moralplays* sind in dem komischen *Interlude* wieder anzutreffen. Mit Ausnahme von zweien (P. F. und J. H.), schliessen alle mit moralisirenden Ansprachen an das Publicum.¹

Apparently Swoboda openly admits that in this point his thesis is inadequate to account for *John* and *Pardoner*.

10. Einen weiteren Berührungspunkt zwischen den *Moralplays* und dem komischen *Interlude* bildet die Art und Weise, wie eine Art von poetischer Gerechtigkeit geübt wird. Die Personen der Stücke werden von der Schlechtigkeit ihrer Lebensführung und der gefährlichen Verkehrtheit ihrer Anschauungen überzeugt und am Ende zu besserer Aufführung und Reue bekehrt: die Sittlichkeit triumphirt. Ganz in derselben Weise werden im *Wetterspiel* die Bittsteller von der Unvereinbarkeit ihrer Wünsche überzeugt und schliesslich gezwungen, die Weisheit der bestehenden Weltregierung anzuerkennen. Die Liebesleute im *Loveplay* müssen nach langwierigem Streite endlich zugeben, dass wahre Glückseligkeit nur in der Liebe Gottes zu finden sei. Die *Vier P* müssen sich trotz ihrer im Stücke so weit auseinandergehenden Ansichten zum Schluss der Autorität der Kirche unterordnen. *Wit and Folly* endigt mit der Niederlage und Bekehrung James, des Verfechters des im Stücke abgehandelten paradoxen Satzes.²

Whether or not this point be important even for the plays to which it applies, Swoboda does not attempt to apply it to *John*, *Pardoner*, and *Four PP*.

11. Wie die Moralitäten, so weist auch das komische *Interlude* eine entschieden satirische Tendenz auf.³

Although we grant that several of Heywood's plays contain keen and enjoyable satire, we find no proof that this "satirische tendenz" can come only from morality-plays.

After making these eleven observations, Swoboda says:

Diese Erwägungen, glaube ich, sind hinreichend, die Innigkeit des Zusammenhanges zwischen den Moralitäten und Heywoods komischen Interlude zu beweisen.⁴

Then, with pointing out several striking verbal parallels between Heywood's work and that of Chaucer and Skelton, Swoboda closes his chapter on "Das verhältniss des komischen interludes zu literarischen vorgängern."

¹ SWOBODA, p. 62.

³ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

I have sufficiently indicated my objections to the separate points involved in Swoboda's main thesis. Apparently this thesis fails to account satisfactorily or completely for a single play of John Heywood.

In conclusion, I venture to suggest a new genealogy for Heywood's six plays. In the first place, on the basis of their types, the plays fall into two groups. *Love, Weather*, and *Wit and Folly* follow the *débat* tradition; *John, Pardoner*, and *Four PP* are intimately related to French farce.

Though *Wit and Folly* is clearly an example of *débat*, the absurdly amusing nature of the discussion and the circumstances of its production at court allow it to be classified under farce, a type to which it is not essentially related. *John* and *Pardoner* are first-rate examples of French farce with extant parallels in France. Although difficult to classify, *Four PP* is most closely related to farce in spirit, and most closely related to *débat* in form.

Therefore, granting every morality-play characteristic that Swoboda has correctly attributed to Heywood's plays, I still maintain that these plays are not "legitime nachkommen der moralitäten."

In view of the conclusions reached in this article, we must assign to John Heywood a new place in the history of English drama. Although surrounded by miracle-plays, moral-plays, and Latinized plays, he produced a type of drama so distinctly his own that Collier calls it "an entire novelty."¹ From the English point of view, Heywood's plays² were an entire novelty, for, free from logical connection with previous English drama, they are in model and inspiration wholly foreign—they are frank adaptations or imitations of French farce. Just as in *Ralph Roister Doister* Nicholas Udall introduced Latin comedy into England, so in *Johan Johan the husbände* Heywood gave England its first pure, unattached³ French farce.

¹ Cf. p. 1 above.

² I refer especially to *John, Pardoner, Four PP*, and *Wit and Folly*.

³ By "unattached" I distinguish *John* from such a play as *Secunda Pastorum* of the Towneley miracle-plays, where the farce of the Mak episode is only part of a larger play and of a cycle.

Though we must grant, then, that our author attained his eminence through his sympathetic following of a French model, and though this alien inspiration may detract somewhat from his dignity as an original genius, still we must class John Heywood with Udall and the authors of *Gorboduc* as one of the most significant innovators of early English drama.

KARL YOUNG.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.